

**Reply Under 37 CFR 1.116  
Expedited Procedure  
Technology Center 3744**

Application No.: 10/541,803

Docket No.: 29171/39318A

**APPLICANTS' SUMMARY OF EXAMINER INTERVIEW**

Having received and reviewed the Advisory Action and the Examiner's Interview Summary transmitted on January 11, 2011, Applicants' attorney, Jeremy D. Protas (#61,681), initiated a telephonic interview with Examiner Flanigan on January 20, 2011. During the interview, the participants discussed the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and, in particular, discussed that the pending claim language refers to a plurality of intersections corresponding to a plurality of flow branch points (claim 1) or to a plurality of intersections (claim 10) meeting the conditions recited by the claim and does not, as the Advisory Action indicates, require every intersection in the unit element or the heat sink to have a second outgoing flow orthogonal to the first outgoing flow. Applicants' attorney understood the Examiner to agree that the language does not refer to every intersection in the claimed apparatus and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph would be properly withdrawn.

Applicants' thank the Examiner for graciously accommodating the Applicants' request for an additional interview.